



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/857,115	12/26/2001	Steve Qi	033236-0115	9673
7590	10/23/2003		EXAMINER [REDACTED]	MOHAMED, ABDEL A
Stephen A Bent Foley & Lardner Washington Harbour 3000 K Street NW Suite 500 Washington, DC 20007-5109			ART UNIT [REDACTED]	PAPER NUMBER 1653
DATE MAILED: 10/23/2003				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/857,115	QI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Abdel A. Mohamed	1653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-13 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

The preliminary amendments filed 12/26/01 and 3/16/02, respectively are acknowledged, entered and considered. In view of Applicant's request claims 1 and 2 have been amended and claims 7-13 have been added. Thus, claims 1-13 are now pending in the application.

RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-5, drawn to pharmaceutical formulation comprising peptides with biodegradable polymers, classified in class 530, subclasses 328.
- II. Claims 6-13, drawn to a method for treatment of disorders by administering the pharmaceutical formulation of Group I and use of such formulation thereof, classified in class 514, subclasses 15.

Claim 1 link(s) inventions II and I. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 6-13. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting

rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

The sequence limitations SEQ ID NO:7, for example, shows that conserved or nonconserved amino acid can be substituted for any of Xaa's. Therefore, that sequence described as SEQ ID NO:7 or SEQ ID NO:6 encompasses peptides having different structures. These peptides are therefore patentably distinct one from the other. In addition, the sequences are patentably distinct because they are unrelated sequences and each unrelated sequence is considered a separate and distinct product, therefore, a further restriction is applied to each sequences. For an elected invention drawn to either amino acid or polypeptide sequences, the Applicant must further elect a single amino acid or a single polypeptide sequence (See MPEP 803.04). Due to the increasingly large size of sequence databases which must be searched and the increasing numbers of applications requiring sequence searches, it creates an undue burden on the Office to search more than a single sequence (product) per application. For these reasons, the requirements of 37 CFR 1.141 *et seq.* are no longer waived and Applicant is required to elect a single sequence for examination. Applicant is reminded that this is a restriction requirement, not an election of species.

Furthermore, a) Applicant's response should indicate the specific Group, I or II that is elected. b) Applicant's response should indicate one specific peptide by SEQ ID

NO:. c) Where the elected peptide defined by SEQ ID NO: contain "Xaa" in the sequence, Applicant also needs to uniquely identify a specific amino acid residue (e.g., Tyrosine at position 5) for each Xaa in the sequence (See e.g., SEQ ID NO:7). d) Applicant is to elect a single disclosed sequence, and/or provide a single subsequence within a disclosed sequence wherein the subsequence for the elected is searched.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and because the searches for individual subject sets are not coextensive, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

ELECTION OF SPECIES

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

I) a) Polymers listed in claims 3 or 4 or 9, and b) Disorders listed in claims 10 or 11 or 13.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1 and 6 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim

is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include: (1) an election of the invention to be examined, (2) an election of the species of protein and indicate claims reading thereon, even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

A telephone call was made to Stephen A. Bent on 10/7/03 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not

commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

CONCLUSION AND FUTURE CORRESPONDANCE

Claims 1-13 is subjected to restriction and/or species election requirement.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdel A. Mohamed whose telephone number is (703) 308-3966. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 A.M to 5:00 P.M. The examiner can also be reached on alternated Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher S.F. Low can be reached on (703) 308-2923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/857,115
Art Unit: 1653

Page 8

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Mohamed/AAM
October 10, 2003

Christopher S. F. Low
CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600